

Remarks/Arguments

Entry of this amendment is respectfully requested on the grounds that it responds to new grounds of rejection made for the first time in the final Office action dated 07 February 2008.

Entry of this amendment is also respectfully requested on the grounds that it overcomes the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejection and places the application in condition for allowance. Alternatively, entry is requested on the grounds that the amendment places the application in better condition for appeal.

In paragraph 1 of the Office action, independent claims 8, 14, 23, and 27 stand rejected on the basis that it is not clear what is meant by the phrase "adjusting a delay based on an accuracy of said data read operations." The examiner also raises a question with respect to whether "said data read operations" refers to the previously recited "write/read operations." In response, each of claims 8, 14, 23, and 27 has been amended to recite "adjusting a delay based on an accuracy of data read compared to data written in said data write/read operations."

Support for the amendment is found in paragraph 30 of the published application which provides as follows:

[0030] It is noted here that, as part of the DLL calibration process, while each pair of victim and aggressor bits is present on the corresponding bit lines in the data bus 18, the processor 14 (FIG. 1) may perform a test data write/read operation (block 74 in FIG. 3) on the memory cells 26 with the help of the memory controller 32. In an alternative embodiment, the processor 14 may be configured to perform the test data write/read operation after the entire aggressor and victim patterns are output on corresponding bit lines in the data bus 18. Based on the accuracy or integrity of the data read during various data write/read operations throughout the test pattern generation process at blocks 73-79, the processor 14 (preferably, the memory controller 32) may adjust (preferably, after the conclusion of the test pattern generation at block 80) the value of the delay programmed in the DLL 40 to be applied to the strobe signals from the strobe generation circuit 38. The programming of the DLL may be referred to as "DLL calibration." As is known in the art, the process of DLL calibration typically involves reading memory data relative to the memory controller 32; the data is written and then read back with a middle DLL setting for the data receiving strobe. The data read is then checked for

errors against the data written. This process may be repeated with various DLL settings until an error is found at the longest/highest delay setting and at the lowest/shortest delay setting. The DLL may be then set or "calibrated" in the middle of these two settings. This process could also be applied to data writes using a DLL on the transmit/write strobe. A detailed description of how a DLL may be calibrated can be found in the U.S. Pat. No. 6,401,213 to Jeddelloh, the disclosure of which is incorporated herein by reference in its entirety. (emphasis added)

It is seen that the amendments to the independent claims clarify that the read data was written in the data write/read operation. Further, the "adjusting a delay" language found in the claims is taken substantially from paragraph 30 of the published application recited above.

Changes have been made to the preambles of claims 8 and 27 to focus attention on the processor and not the memory. That change is made to conform method claims 8 and 27 to apparatus claims 14 and 23 in which it is the processor that is configured to perform the method. Finally, the word "lines", missing from line 10 of claim 23, has been added by this amendment.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejection of the claims has now been overcome.

Statement of the Substance of the Interview

On 01 May 2008, proposed claim amendments were faxed to the examiner. The proposed claim amendments contain the amendments to the independent claims found in the instant amendment. On 06 May 2008, the undersigned attorney called the examiner to discuss the changes. The undersigned attorney presented the arguments set forth above. No agreement was reached, and the examiner advised the undersigned attorney to formally submit the proposed claim amendments.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the instant application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance for pending claims 3, 7-10, 12, 14, and 16-30 is respectfully requested. If the examiner is of the opinion that the instant application is in

Appl. No. 10/766,386
Amdt. dated 07 May 2008
Reply to Office Action of 07 February 2008

condition for disposition other than through allowance, the examiner is respectfully requested to contact applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Edward L. Pencoske
Reg. No. 29,688
Jones Day
One Mellon Center
500 Grant Street, Suite 3100
Pittsburgh, PA, USA, 15219
Direct No.: (412) 394-9531
Facsimile No.: (412) 394-7959
Attorneys for Applicants